



European Defense Community Treaty

Source: *International Organization*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Aug., 1954), pp. 409-410

Published by: [University of Wisconsin Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2704519>

Accessed: 17/06/2014 19:47

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Wisconsin Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to
International Organization.

<http://www.jstor.org>

European Defense Community Treaty

In the first four months of 1954, four signatories of the EDC treaty⁴¹ either deposited instruments of ratification or completed parliamentary action on ratification; the instrument of ratification of the German Federal Republic was deposited on March 31 and the parliaments of Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg ratified the treaty on January 20, March 12, and April 7, respectively.

During discussions among the United States, United Kingdom, and French High Commissioners for Germany a difference of opinion developed over approving amendments to the Bonn Constitution to permit the German Federal Republic to join EDC and raise an army. The French High Commissioner wanted to place two conditions on the approval: 1) that the proposed amendment not become effective until EDC had entered into force and 2) that the protocols which representatives of the EDC powers had concluded in March 1953⁴² be signed by the six foreign ministers and ratified by the several parliaments. The other High Commissioners were willing to accept the first condition but opposed the second, feeling that it would indefinitely delay ratification of the treaty. Eventually, the French High Commissioner withdrew his second condition.⁴³

On April 14, 1954, the text of a new agreement between the United Kingdom and the signatories of EDC was made public. In addition to providing machinery for consultation between EDC and the United Kingdom, the treaty pledged the parties to take effective measures to ensure cooperation between their respective armed forces placed under the command of SACEUR with the ultimate aim of enabling the forces of EDC and the United Kingdom to operate together. Specific provision was made for the inclusion of units of the Royal Air Force within EDC formations.⁴⁴

In a letter to the Premiers of the six EDC countries on April 16, the President of the United States said that his government would conform its actions under NATO to the following policies and undertakings: 1) the United States would continue to maintain in Europe, including Germany, such armed forces as might be necessary and appropriate for as long as a threat to the area existed; 2) the United States would consult with NATO and EDC on questions of mutual concern, including the level of forces to be placed at the command of SACEUR by itself, other NATO members and EDC; 3) the United States would encourage the closest possible integration between EDC forces and all NATO forces; 4) the United States would continue to seek means of extending to the Atlantic community increased security by sharing information on military use of new weapons; 5) the United States would regard any action from whatever quarter which threatened the integrity or unity of EDC as a threat to the security of the United States and would consult with other NATO members under the terms of Article 4 of the NATO treaty; and 6) the United States

⁴¹ For previous information on EDC, see *International Organization*, VII, p. 441.

⁴² See *ibid.*, p. 441.

⁴³ *New York Times*, March 25, 1954; *ibid.*, March 26, 1954.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, April 15, 1954.

would consider it contrary to its security interests to cease to be a party to NATO when there had been established on the continent of Europe "the solid core of unity" which EDC would provide.⁴⁵

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Council

The following summary covers the activities of the Council of the Organization of American States from its 118th meeting on December 3, 1952, through its 129th meeting on April 1, 1953.¹

On January 7, 1953, the Council approved the report of the Finance Committee on the budget for the fiscal year 1953-1954: \$2,939,030 for the expenses of the Pan American Union, \$219,524 for the Inter-American Defense Board, and \$1,377 for repayment of advances from the Working Capital Fund. Of this amount, members would contribute \$3,159,941; making allowance for income from miscellaneous sources, the budget was \$225,782 higher than for the preceding fiscal year.² The Council also approved the scale of assessments for the coming fiscal year; contributions by members ranged from 66 percent for the United States, 8.81 percent for Brazil and 7.42 percent for Argentina to 0.24 percent each for Costa Rica, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua and Paraguay.³ The attention of member governments was drawn to a report submitted to the Council on March 4, 1953, by the Finance Committee on the status of members' contributions; the report revealed that six countries had paid in full their quotas for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, four countries had paid in part while eleven had as yet made no payment. Two members still owed part of their quotas for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 while four had made no payment on that quota. Three members still owed their quotas of the budgets of fiscal years before 1951-1952.⁴

During the period reviewed, the Council adopted several reports and resolutions concerning the organization and operation of its committees. On December 5, 1952, Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, the United States, Mexico, the Dominican Republic, and Uruguay were appointed to the Committee on Inter-American Organizations and Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, the United States, Haiti, and Honduras were appointed to the Committee on Inter-American Conferences.⁵ The following states were appointed members of the Finance Committee on March 4: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Mexico, and the United States.⁶ Dr. Hector David Castro (El Salvador) was appointed Council representative on the Committee of the Leo S. Rowe Pan American Fund according to a decision of January 7, 1953.⁷ Acting on the basis of a memorandum submitted by Brazil, the Council on December 5, 1952,

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, April 17, 1954.

¹ For information on earlier Council meetings, see *International Organization*, VII, p. 295-296.

² *Annals of the Organization of American States*, V, p. 187-188.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 199.

⁵ Document C-sa-119.

⁶ Document C-sa-126-E.

⁷ Document C-sa-121.